



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Text-Critical Notes on Ezekiel.

PROF. C. H. TOY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

1. v. 11. וְגַם אֲנִי אֶנְרַע וְלֹא תַחֵם עֵינִי וְגַם אֲנִי לֹא אַחֲמֹל.

In this passage, which is a threat of punishment for previously detailed sins, **אֶנְרַע** yields no satisfactory sense.

Withdraw (my eye), after Job xxxvi. 7 (Ges., Reuss, Orelli, RV marg.), is against the connection, the point being precisely that Yahwe's eye is not withdrawn. *Diminish, take from* (the people), after Deut. iv. 2 (Hävernicks, RV), is too feeble for the tone of the passage. The reading **אֶנְרַע** *cut off*, found in some Heb. MSS., is inappropriate. The Verss. are equally unsatisfactory. G (followed by S) ἀγάγε ἀπὸ σωμαί σε, from **נֶרֶשׁ** or **מֵאֵם**, with object added, a form of threat never elsewhere employed by Ezekiel; **נֶרֶשׁ** is never used in O.T. of the dealing of Yahwe with Israel; J *confringam* = **פָּרֵץ**, or perh. = **נֶרֶשׁ**, as T קִטָּף. Of the emendations heretofore proposed no one seems to me satisfactory. Ewald (followed by Graetz), after xxiv. 14, **לֹא אֶפְרַע**, *I will not go back*; but, besides the insertion of the negative (which is here a difficult procedure), the motive of **אֶפְרַע** in xxiv. 14 (the assertion of Yahwe's determination not to recede from what he has said) is wanting in our passage, in which there is no reference to a preceding threat. Hitzig, Nif. of **פָּרַע**, *I will give myself free rein*, after Prov. xxix. 18, a doubtful expression, used in Proverbs in bad sense; Cornill, **אֶתְנַרַּע**, *I will bestir myself, enter the field*, which is too military, is never elsewhere used of Yahwe, and does not suit the context; Davidson's **עָלִיךְ** (cf. v. 8 and xxi. 8) is in itself appropriate and in accordance with Ezekiel's usage; but one expects here (as compared with v. 8) a definite term of action; Siegfried (in Kautzsch) **אָנַע**, *I will strike (in)*, is not here appropriate.

We expect here a formula, such as is given in viii. 18, whence we may read **אֶעֱשֶׂה בְּחֵמָה**. If **ב'** had fallen out, **א'** might easily be corrupted into **אֶנְרַע**; the disappearance of **ב'** must be regarded as a possible scribal accident.

2. xix. 2. The opening distich of this *qina* מָה אִמְךָ לִבְיָא בֵּין אֲרִיֹת רִבְצָה בְּתוֹךְ כְּפָרִים רִבְתָּה נִוְרִיָּה is rhythmically and otherwise unsatisfactory, and the Versions substantially follow the Hebrew and offer no help. Budde (*ZAT.* ii. 1 ff.) inserts a second רִבְצָה after כְּפָרִים, and Cornill (*Ezech.*) transfers the 'ר of the text to the same place. These changes relieve the rhythmical difficulty in part, but do not touch the equally serious lexicographical and rhythmical difficulty of the מָה. The rendering *what is* (or *was*) *thy mother? a lioness* is insufferably unrhythmical, and *how is* (or *was*) *thy mother a lioness* is unintelligible; Jerome does not better it with his *why did thy mother, a lioness, couch among lions?* Nothing can be made of the מָה, and the form of vs. 10 (אִמְךָ כִּנְפֵן) suggests that vs. 2 contains a comparison. This may be got by reading דְּמָה אִמְךָ לִלְבִּיָּא *thy mother is like a lioness*; the ד may have fallen out through preceding ת in ואמרת. If the present time expressed by the participle be thought inappropriate, the perf. דָּמַתָּה might be read, though there is no difficulty in taking the comparisons here and in vs. 10 as present. With this change, if the division of the verse be made at אֲרִיֹת, the rhythm becomes reasonable, but is improved by the transposition of 'ר (as Cornill proposes) so that it shall stand after כְּפָרִים. The verse would read in the first case:

Thy mother is like a lioness — among lions;
She couched amid lions — she reared her whelps;

and in the second case:

Thy mother is like a lioness — among lions;
Amid lions she couched — she reared her whelps.

The attachment of *reared* to *couched* is desirable.

3. xix. 7. וַיִּרְעוּ אֲלֵמִנּוֹתָיו (וַיִּצְרְחוּ הָחַרְיִים) [וִירַע] *G* καὶ ἐνέμετο [וִירַע] τῷ θράσει αὐτοῦ [מַעֲוָה?]; Peshitto, *he walked in his might* (free rendering after *G*); Targum, *he destroyed his palaces* (or *castles*); Jerome, *didicit viduas facere*. Of the old Versions none seems to have had our Hebrew text except that of Jerome, and he did not understand it. To Ewald's וַיִּרְעוּ אֲרַמְנוֹתֵיהֶם *he brake their palaces*, Hitzig's objection that רַע is used of breaking vessels but not palaces (for which נָתַן is the term) seems to be well taken, and a similar objection must be made to וַיִּרְעוּ אֲרַמְנוֹת (אֲרַמְנוֹת) in Graetz's וַיִּרְעוּ אֲלֵמִנּוֹת. Hitzig's own emendation וַיִּעַר אֶל מַעֲנּוֹתָיו *he carried off his prey to his lair*, is remote, and too feeble for the context, in which destruction is spoken of; and a similar objection holds to that of

Cornill, who changes Hitzig's verb to **וירבע** *he lay down in his lair* (see ψ civ. 22, cxxxix. 3). Davidson (and so Marti, cited by Siegfried in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift*) suggests **וירב** *he multiplied his widows*, but this again is unsatisfactory since the connection rather suggests a reference to some physical destruction. It is perhaps impossible to restore the text with certainty. But, following the parallel clause, we may seek for terms corresponding to the **החריב** and the **עריהם**, and suggest **וירע למענותיהם** *and he ravaged their dwellings* (cf. Jer. xxxi. 28, where this verb occurs as synonym of various expressions of destruction).

4. xxiii. 5, 12. **קרובים**, written **קרואים** in vs. 23. The connection calls for an Assyrian title of rank, but Ewald is not justified in adopting an Aramaic **קרבים** in the sense of *warriors*. Cornill corrects the text-word of vs. 5, 12 to **קרואים**, after vs. 23, referring to Num. i. 16, xvi. 2. In these passages **קריאי** (i. 16 Qeri **קרואי**) occurs as parallel to **נשיאי**, and in xvi. 2 **אנשי שם** is parallel to **קריאי מועד**; in Num. xxvi. 9 Kethib is **קרואי**, Qeri **קריאי**. The expressions in these verses are to be rendered "chosen men of the congregation," that is, chief men. But **קרואים** (or **קריאים**) never occurs alone as a title, and it is very doubtful whether it can here be so taken. It seems better, therefore, to look for a term which is definitely an official designation, and from **קרבים**, by omitting the first letter, we get the familiar **רבים**, which occurs in Jer. xxxix. 13 as the title of Babylonian officers of high rank. Ezekiel employs the term in this sense nowhere else; but this is true also of the other titles found in this chapter, **פחות**, **סגנים**, **שלישים**. That a **ק** should have been written before **רבים** in vs. 5, 12 is not graphically improbable in the combination **רבים ראש**, and **קראים**, vs. 23, would then be scribal corruption of **קרבים**.

5. xxiv. 17. **לחם אנשים** which in the connection gives no sense. In Jer. xvi. 7 there is reference to bread and drink of consolation, but the expression of our verse is not used, and cannot mean *bread of consolation*. Hitzig's **ל' אנשים** is without support from Hebrew usage, and Wellhausen's **ל' אנשים** does not mean what the context calls for; it could only signify *bread of the ill or bad*. The proper expression seems to be given in Hos. ix. 4, **לחם אנים** *bread of mourning*, from which our text-word would come by insertion of **ש**.

6. xxv. 6. **יֵזֶן מִחֶאֱדָר יָד וּרְקֶעֶךְ בְּרִגְלָו וְתִשְׁמַח בְּכָל שְׂאֲמֹךְ בְּנֶפֶשׁ** **אֶל אֶדְמַת יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The Heb. is followed by Jerome and Targum,

except that they omit the suff. in 'ש' and the prefix in 'בני'; 'ש' is given by Aquila, and substantially by Theod. (σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ σοῦ = בכל שאַתך). Sept. (followed by Syr.) reads καὶ ἐπέχαρας ἐκ ψυχῆς σου. That this is the rendering of ש' בנפש (and not, as Cornill holds, of ותשמה ב') appears from the Sept. rendering (ἐπιχαίροντες ἐκ ψυχῆς) of the similar Heb. phrase in vs. 15, and from the Old Latin here, *et insultasti in anima tua*. If ות' בני be not deleted, it should be changed to ושמחך בלב (cf. xxxvi. 5); but it is better to omit it, as it destroys the symmetry of the sentence, and is lacking in Sept. Graetz inserts לב after כל, as in xxxvi. 5. If my emendation is accepted, ו should be inserted before שאטך, with Sept., and in accordance with the requirements of the connection. In xxxvi. 5 בשמחת is rendered in Sept. by μετ' εὐφροσύνης and כשאט נפש by ἀτιμάσαντες ψυχάς. This, however, is not proof that שאט cannot be the original of ἐπέχαρας in xxv. 6, for in xxv. 3 (as Cornill observes) a similar expression of scorn, אמרך האה, is rendered by ἐπεχάρατε.

7. xxx. 5. The peoples attached to Egypt in the Mas. text are: כוש, פוט, לוד, כל הערב, כוב, בני ארץ הברית, כוש; Sept. Πέρσαι (פרס, scribal error for כוש), Κρήτες (elsewhere Sept.^B has Λίβυες for פוט), Λυδοί, Λίβυες, πάντες οἱ ἐπίμικτοι, τῶν νύων τῆς διαθήκης. כוש and פוט should stand; the doubtful לוד (see Stade, *De pop. Javan*, p. 6 f.; W. M. Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, p. 115 n. 3) may be changed to לוב, as in the Syriac; ערב should probably be pointed ערב; the change of the unknown כוב to לוב, with Sept., is a natural suggestion, but Λίβυες may represent preceding פוט, and כול suits the connection (it is preceded by כל הערב); the הברית is best read הכרת (so Cornill and Siegfried), after Jer. xxv. 20 (פלשתים), Ezek. xxv. 16 (and cf. Κρήτες above), and בני ארץ must be omitted as gloss. The Egyptian allies will then be: Cush, Put, Libya, Arabs, Philistines, a list which gives a regular movement from south to north. פוט in xxvii. 10 and כוש and פוט in xxxviii. 5 are difficult geographically, perhaps miswritings.

8. xxxvi. 5. למען מגרשה לבו. For למען מגרשה G has τοῦ 'αφανίσαι, Targum תרכות, representing Heb. גרש, but this (to say nothing of the difficulty of an Infin. form מגרש) hardly suits the connection: *the nations have exultingly taken the Israelitish territory not to drive it out*. Cornill takes τοῦ 'αφανίσαι as representing not מגרשה (which he thinks is corruption of מורשה) but some word like למעצא (בו) (whence might come M למען), and suggests (בו) למעצא. Yet

we desiderate Infin. with suffix at the end of the sentence, and may perhaps read *למען רשתה ובוה* *to possess it and to plunder it.* *מורשה* may be corruption of *רשתה* under the influence of preceding *מורשה*. Peshiṭto has *that they may lead them captive and spoil them*, apparently taking 'מ' from *גרש*, but understanding two Infins., as the sentence suggests. Graetz, throwing out *מורשה* as corruption from preceding *מורשה*, reads *ללעג ולבוז*, *to deride and to spoil* (after vs. 4), a simple and graphically not difficult emendation, if *מורשה* be omitted, though the Infins. should have the suffix.